UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/627,372	07/28/2000	Yue Pan	JP9-1999-0804US1(590.017)	2744

35195 7590 07/27/2005

FERENCE & ASSOCIATES
409 BROAD STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15143

EXAMINER	
LY, ANH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/627,372	PAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anh Ly	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 May 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicants' Amendment filed on 05/13/2005.

2. Claims 1-16 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 2004/0194018 A1 of Abir in view of US Patent No.: 6,006,4221 issued to Liddy et al. (hereinafter Liddy) and further in view of US Patent No.: 5,842,206 issued to Sotomayor.

With respect to claim 1, Abir teaches receiving an original of query requests from an Internet user, said original query request containing query words of native language of said user (user is input the search request or search query in his/her native language: section 0052); and

selecting a suitable search engine from a plurality of search engines (selecting from a plurality of search engines for using his/her native language to search: section 0052).

Abir teaches a user of Internet network for searching documents over the World Wide Web by using his/her own native language to enter the search query and sending this search query to the selected one of the plurality of search engines, selecting search engines from a URL and conversion to and from any native language (sections 0046, 0050 and 0052). Abir does not clearly teach translating said query words of native language into query words of dedicated language of said selected search engine, constructing a new query request directed to said selected search engine; based on said original query request and said query words of dedicated language, sending said new query request to said selected search engine and receiving a returned query result, and sending said query result back to said user as a query result in relation to said original query request.

However, Liddy teaches translation of search query into multiple language (col. 22, lines 30-45); generating search query (col. 8, lines 5-16and col. 21, lines 10-20); receiving search result and sending back search result back to user (col. 6, lines 38-48 and col. 8, lines 5-16).

Therefore, based on Abir in view of Liddy, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Liddy to the system of Abir for the user entered search query or query words to translate it into another language for a suitable search engine from a plurality of search engines. Abir and Liddy do not teach each of said search engines having a respective dedicated language.

However, Sotomayor teaches translating the search expression to a form understandable by each particular search engine (fig. 3, col. 5, lines 8-24).

Therefore, based on Abir in view of Liddy, and further in view of Sotomayor, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Sotomayor to the system of Abir to provide a search result with efficient information retrieval for native language multi-lingual query service environment.

With respect to claim 2, Abir teaches the step of selecting said search engines from said plurality of designated URLs in said original query request as the selected search engine (sections 0016, 0040 and 0046).

With respect to claim 3, Abir teaches a method as discussed in claim 1.

Abir teaches a user of Internet network for searching documents over the World Wide Web by using his/her own native language to enter the search query

and sending this search query to the selected one of the plurality of search engines, selecting search engines from a URL and conversion to and from any native language (sections 0046, 0050 and 0052). Abir does not clearly teach translating said query words of native language into query words of dedicated language of said selected search engine.

However, Liddy teaches translation of search query into multiple language (col. 22, lines 30-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abir with the teachings of Liddy, wherein the translation a search request into another language in the system provided therein (Abir's figs. 4 & 5), would incorporate the use of translation into another native language, in the same conventional manner as described by Liddy (col. 22, lines 30-45). The motivation being to provide a search result with efficient information retrieval for native language multi-lingual query service environment.

With respect to claim 4, Abir teaches a method as discussed in claim 1.

Abir teaches a user of Internet network for searching documents over the World Wide Web by using his/her own native language to enter the search query and sending this search query to the selected one of the plurality of search engines, selecting search engines from a URL and conversion to and from any native language (sections 0046, 0050 and 0052). Abir does not clearly teach translating said query words of native language into query words of dedicated language of said selected search engine.

However, Liddy teaches translation of search query into multiple language (col. 22, lines 30-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abir with the teachings of Liddy, wherein the translation a search request into another language in the system provided therein (Abir's figs. 4 & 5), would incorporate the use of translation into another native language, in the same conventional manner as described by Liddy (col. 22, lines 30-45). The motivation being to provide a search result with efficient information retrieval for native language multi-lingual query service environment.

With respect to claim 5, Abir teaches a method as discussed in claim 1.

Abir teaches a user of Internet network for searching documents over the World Wide Web by using his/her own native language to enter the search query and sending this search query to the selected one of the plurality of search engines, selecting search engines from a URL and conversion to and from any native language (sections 0046, 0050 and 0052). Abir does not clearly teach replacing said query words of native language in said original query request with said query words of said dedicated language so as to form said new query request.

However, Liddy teaches generating search query (col. 8, lines 5-16and col. 21, lines 10-20); receiving search result and sending back search result back to user (col. 6, lines 38-48 and col. 8, lines 5-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abir with the teachings of Liddy, wherein the translation a search request into another language in the system provided therein (Abir's figs. 4 & 5), would incorporate the use of translation into another native language, in the same conventional manner as described by Liddy (col. 22, lines 30-45). The motivation being to provide a search result with efficient information retrieval for native language multi-lingual query service environment.

With respect to claim 6, Abir teaches a method as discussed in claim 1.

Abir teaches a user of Internet network for searching documents over the World Wide Web by using his/her own native language to enter the search query and sending this search query to the selected one of the plurality of search engines, selecting search engines from a URL and conversion to and from any native language (sections 0046, 0050 and 0052). Abir does not clearly teach replacing said query words of native language in said original query request with said query words of said dedicated language so as to form said new query request.

However, Liddy teaches generating search query (col. 8, lines 5-16and col. 21, lines 10-20); receiving search result and sending back search result back to user (col. 6, lines 38-48 and col. 8, lines 5-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abir with the teachings of Liddy, wherein the translation a search request into another

language in the system provided therein (Abir's figs. 4 & 5), would incorporate the use of translation into another native language, in the same conventional manner as described by Liddy (col. 22, lines 30-45). The motivation being to provide a search result with efficient information retrieval for native language multi-lingual query service environment.

With respect to claim 7, Abir teaches receiving at a site said query request from said Internet users, said original query request containing an URL requested by said Internet users, said URL having a prefix for designating a site (user is input the search request or search query in his/her native language: sections 0052; also sections 0012-0013);

removing said prefix from URL (section 0004 and 0040);

selecting a suitable search engine from a plurality of search engines (selecting from a plurality of search engines for using his/her native language to search: section 0052).

sending a request containing said URL to said selected search engine and receiving a web page as response, adding a translation prefix before URLs that need said query words and a redirect prefix before other URLs in said web page, so as to form a new web page (sections 0004, 0046 and 0047-0048);

adding said redirect prefix before said URL, generating a new web page, embedding said URL and a Script program in said web page, said Script program enabling a client which receives said new web page to perform a step of automatically sending another original query request based on said URL

embedded in said web page; sending said new web page (sections 0047-0048, figs. 13-15).

Abir teaches a user of Internet network for searching documents over the World Wide Web by using his/her own native language to enter the search query and sending this search query to the selected one of the plurality of search engines, selecting search engines from a URL and conversion to and from any native language (sections 0046, 0050 and 0052). Abir does not clearly teach translating said query words of user's native language in a parameters of said URL into said query words of a dedicated language of said selected search engine; replacing said query words of user's native language.

However, Liddy teaches translation of search query into multiple language (col. 22, lines 30-45); generating search query (col. 8, lines 5-16and col. 21, lines 10-20); receiving search result and sending back search result back to user (col. 6, lines 38-48 and col. 8, lines 5-16).

Therefore, based on Abir in view of Liddy, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Liddy to the system of Abir for the user entered search query or query words to translate it into another language for a suitable search engine from a plurality of search engines. Abir and Liddy do not teach each of said search engines having a respective dedicated language.

However, Sotomayor teaches translating the search expression to a form understandable by each particular search engine (fig. 3, col. 5, lines 8-24).

Therefore, based on Abir in view of Liddy, and further in view of Sotomayor, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Sotomayor to the system of Abir to provide a search result with efficient information retrieval for native language multi-lingual query service environment.

With respect to claim 8, Abir teaches selecting said search engine designated by said URL as said selected search engine (section 0052).

With respect to claim 9, Abir teaches a method as discussed in claim 7.

Abir teaches a user of Internet network for searching documents over the World Wide Web by using his/her own native language to enter the search query and sending this search query to the selected one of the plurality of search engines, selecting search engines from a URL and conversion to and from any native language (sections 0046, 0050 and 0052). Abir does not clearly teach translating said query words of native language into query words of dedicated language of said selected search engine.

However, Liddy teaches translation of search query into multiple language (col. 22, lines 30-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abir with the teachings of Liddy, wherein the translation a search request into another language in the system provided therein (Abir's figs. 4 & 5), would incorporate the use of translation into another native language, in the same conventional manner as described by Liddy (col. 22, lines 30-45). The motivation being to

provide a search result with efficient information retrieval for native language multi-lingual query service environment.

With respect to claim 10, Abir teaches a method as discussed in claim 7.

Abir teaches a user of Internet network for searching documents over the World Wide Web by using his/her own native language to enter the search query and sending this search query to the selected one of the plurality of search engines, selecting search engines from a URL and conversion to and from any native language (sections 0046, 0050 and 0052). Abir does not clearly teach translating said query words of native language into query words of dedicated language of said selected search engine.

However, Liddy teaches translation of search query into multiple language (col. 22, lines 30-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abir with the teachings of Liddy, wherein the translation a search request into another language in the system provided therein (Abir's figs. 4 & 5), would incorporate the use of translation into another native language, in the same conventional manner as described by Liddy (col. 22, lines 30-45). The motivation being to provide a search result with efficient information retrieval for native language multi-lingual query service environment.

With respect to claim 11, Abir teaches a method as discussed in claim 7.

Abir teaches a user of Internet network for searching documents over the World Wide Web by using his/her own native language to enter the search query

and sending this search query to the selected one of the plurality of search engines, selecting search engines from a URL and conversion to and from any native language (sections 0046, 0050 and 0052). Abir does not clearly teach translating said query words of native language into query words of dedicated language of said selected search engine.

However, Liddy teaches translation of search query into multiple language (col. 22, lines 30-45); generating search query (col. 8, lines 5-16and col. 21, lines 10-20); receiving search result and sending back search result back to user (col. 6, lines 38-48 and col. 8, lines 5-16).

Therefore, based on Abir in view of Liddy, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Liddy to the system of Abir for the user entered search query or query words to translate it into another language for a suitable search engine from a plurality of search engines. Abir and Liddy do not teach each of said search engines having a respective dedicated language.

However, Sotomayor teaches translating the search expression to a form understandable by each particular search engine (fig. 3, col. 5, lines 8-24).

Therefore, based on Abir in view of Liddy, and further in view of Sotomayor, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Sotomayor to the system of Abir to provide a search result with efficient information retrieval for native language multi-lingual query service environment.

Claim 16 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a program storage device readable by machine rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

6. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 2004/0194018 A1 of Abir in view of US Patent No.: 6,006,4221 issued to Liddy et al. (hereinafter Liddy) and further in view of US Patent No.: 5,842,206 issued to Sotomayor and US Patent No.: 6,526,426 issued to Lakritz.

With respect to claim 12, Abir teaches receiving query requests sent by clients and returning query results to said clients (user inputs the search request or query or query words: section 0052);

a request distribution apparatus, for receiving said query requests from said client interface, removing prefixes from requested URLs, and distributing said query requests to different components; query request (section 0052);

a web page retrieving apparatus, for receiving said query request whose prefix is a redirect prefix from said request distribution apparatus, and adding a redirect prefix before said URL(sections 0004, 0046, 0048-0049 and 0052);

sending said query request to a search engine designated by an URL and obtaining a requested web page; a web page modification apparatus, for forming a new web page by adding translation prefixes before URLs that need query words and adding redirect prefixes before other URLs in the obtained web page,

and sending said new web page; a query translation apparatus, for receiving said query request, translating query words of user's native language in the requested URL into and replacing them with query words of a dedicated language of said search engine (sections 0011-0013, 0016, 0040 and 0050); and

a web page generation apparatus, for generating a new web page, embedding said URL and to perform a step of automatically sending another query request based on said URL embedded in said web page (sections 0048-0050).

Abir teaches a user of Internet network for searching documents over the World Wide Web by using his/her own native language to enter the search query and sending this search query to the selected one of the plurality of search engines, selecting search engines from a URL and conversion to and from any native language (sections 0046, 0050 and 0052). Abir does not clearly teach translating said query words of native language into query words of dedicated language of said selected search engine.

However, Liddy teaches translation of search query into multiple language (col. 22, lines 30-45); generating search query (col. 8, lines 5-16and col. 21, lines 10-20); receiving search result and sending back search result back to user (col. 6, lines 38-48 and col. 8, lines 5-16).

Therefore, based on Abir in view of Liddy, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Liddy to the system of Abir for the user entered search query or query words to translate it into another language for a suitable search engine

from a plurality of search engines. Abir and Liddy do not teach each of said search engines having a respective dedicated language.

However, Sotomayor teaches translating the search expression to a form understandable by each particular search engine (fig. 3, col. 5, lines 8-24).

Therefore, based on Abir in view of Liddy and further Sotomayor, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Sotomayor to the system of Abir for translating the search query and having a plurality of search engines, each of search engine has its own particularly native language.

Abir, Liddy and Sotomayor do not clearly teach a script program in said web page.

However, Lakritz teaches Script language program from CGI for interlined page or web page (col. 4, lines 39-47 and col. 16, lines 3-10).

Therefore, based on Abir in view of Liddy, and further in view of Sotomayor and Lakritz, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Lakritz to the system of Abir to provide a search result with efficient information retrieval for native language multi-lingual query service environment.

With respect to claim 13, Abir in view of Liddy and Sotomayor teaches a method for providing native language as discussed in claim 12.

Abir teaches a user of Internet network for searching documents over the World Wide Web by using his/her own native language to enter the search query and sending this search query to the selected one of the plurality of search

engines, selecting search engines from a URL and conversion to and from any native language (sections 0046, 0050 and 0052). Abir does not clearly teach translating said query words of native language into query words of dedicated language of said selected search engine.

However, Liddy teaches translation of search query into multiple language (col. 22, lines 30-45); generating search query (col. 8, lines 5-16and col. 21, lines 10-20); receiving search result and sending back search result back to user (col. 6, lines 38-48 and col. 8, lines 5-16).

Therefore, based on Abir in view of Liddy, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Liddy to the system of Abir for the user entered search query or query words to translate it into another language for a suitable search engine from a plurality of search engines. Abir and Liddy do not teach each of said search engines having a respective dedicated language.

However, Sotomayor teaches translating the search expression to a form understandable by each particular search engine (fig. 3, col. 5, lines 8-24).

Therefore, based on Abir in view of Liddy and further Sotomayor, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Sotomayor to the system of Abir for translating the search query and having a plurality of search engines, each of search engine has its own particularly native language.

Abir, Liddy and Sotomayor do not clearly teach query words of native language are speech query words.

However, Lakritz teaches spoken and audible speech language translation (col. 12, lines 56-67). Therefore, based on Abir in view of Liddy, and further in view of Sotomayor and Lakritz, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Lakritz to the system of Abir to provide a search result with efficient information retrieval for native language multi-lingual query service environment.

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 2004/0194018 A1 of Abir in view of US Patent No.: 6,006,4221 issued to Liddy et al. (hereinafter Liddy).

With respect to claim 1, Abir teaches receiving an original of query requests from an Internet user, said original query request containing query words of native language of said user (user is input the search request or search query in his/her native language: section 0052).

Abir teaches a user of Internet network for searching documents over the World Wide Web by using his/her own native language to enter the search query and sending this search query to the selected one of the plurality of search engines, selecting search engines from a URL and conversion to and from any native language (sections 0046, 0050 and 0052). Abir does not clearly teach a query translation apparatus, for translating query words of user's native language in said query requests received by said client interface into and replacing them with query words and a query result obtaining apparatus, for sending the

translated said query requests to the databases designated by said query requests and obtaining said query results.

However, Liddy teaches translation of search query into multiple language (col. 22, lines 30-45); generating search query (col. 8, lines 5-16and col. 21, lines 10-20); receiving search result and sending back search result back to user (col. 6, lines 38-48 and col. 8, lines 5-16).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abir with the teachings of Liddy, wherein the translation a search request into another language in the system provided therein (Abir's figs. 4 & 5), would incorporate the use of translation into another native language, in the same conventional manner as described by Liddy (col. 22, lines 30-45). The motivation being to provide a search result with efficient information retrieval for native language multi-lingual query service environment.

8. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 2004/0194018 A1 of Abir in view of US Patent No.: 6,006,4221 issued to Liddy et al. (hereinafter Liddy) and further in view of US Patent No. 6,526,426 issued to Lakritz.

With respect to claim 15, Abir in view of Liddy teaches a system for providing native language as discussed in claim 14.

Abir and Liddy disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Abir and Liddy do not teach query words of native language are speech query words.

However, Lakritz teaches spoken and audible speech language translation (col. 12, lines 56-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Abir in view of Liddy with the teachings of Lakritz wherein provided for translation into selected language (col. 12, lines 56-67) would incorporate the use of spoken words and audible speech language to be translated into designated languages. The motivation being to have efficient information over an Internet with a plurality of search engines each has its own native language multi-lingual query service environment.

Contact Information

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV **or fax to (571) 273-4039**. The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or **Primary Examiner Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see **http://pair-direct.uspto.gov**. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: Central Fax Center **(571) 273-8300**

ANH LY
JUL. 19th, 2005

JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER